

CONSULTANT SELECTION COMBINED CONSENSUS SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project	description
	Renton Technical College - New Health Science Cener
Project	Number
,	2022-001
Name o	of Selection Panel Chair
	Ariel Birtley

	This Scoreshee	et Becomes I	<u>Public Recor</u>	d			Ariel Birtley		
Phase 1 - SOQ		Date:	9/6/2021				Number of Subm	nitting Firms:	3
				Panelist Names			DIVERSE	TOTAL	DUAGE 4
	Firms	Ariel Birtley	Laurie Kearney	Barry Baker	Jacob Jackson	Jonathan Taylor	BUSINESS EQUITY & INCLUSION STRATEGIES	PANEL RANKED SCORE	PHASE 1 RANK ORDER
4 UDD Archit		Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Vaa		_
1 HDR Archit		1	1	3	3	3	Yes	11	3
2 McGranaha		3	3	<u>2</u> 1	2	2	Yes	12 7	1
3 Schreiber 3	Starling Whitehead	2	2	<u> </u>	1	1	Yes		1
4									
5									
6									
/									
9									
10		+							
12		+							
13		+							
14		+							
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
Phase 2 Intervie	\M	Date:	9/15/2021				Number of Firms	Interviewed:	3
Thase 2 lintervie	vv	Date.		R OF COMMITTE	E MEMBERS		Number of Fifths	interviewed.	3
			IVAIN ON DE	COL COMMITTE					
	Firms	Ariel Birtley	Laurie Kearney	Barry Baker	Jacob Jackson	Jonathan Taylor	DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN	TOTAL ASSIGNED RANKS	FINAL RANK ORDER
		Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order			
1 McGranaha	n Architects	3	2	2	2	2	included	11	2
2 Schreiber S	Starling Whitehead	1	1	1	1	1	included	5	1
3 HDR Archit	ecture	2	3	3	3	3	included	14	3
4									
5									
		•					•		

Arisl Birtley

Ariel Birtley

Earry Baker

Barry Baker

Jacob Jackson

Jordan Taylor Sp 23, 2021 14:44 PE



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description				
Renton Technical	College	- New	Health	Science
	Cene	r		
O D-4-		D N		

Consensus Date

9/6/2021

2022-001

Name of Selection Panel Member

Ariel Birtley

CRITERIA	Diverse Business Equity & Inclusion Strategies	Experience		& Innovation		Qualifica Key Pe		Perforn	nst nance & ject jement		inable sign rience	Analysis e Experience		TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK ORDER
Scores	Yes/ No	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	15%	Raw Score	15%	Raw Score	15%	Raw Score	5%	SCORE	
1 HDR Architecture	Yes	97.0	24.3	95.0	23.8	95.0	14.3	95.0	14.3	96.0	14.4	92.0	4.6	95.5	1
2 McGranahan Architects	Yes	90.0	22.5	91.0	22.8	92.0	13.8	88.0	13.2	90.0	13.5	90.0	4.5	90.3	3
3 Schreiber Starling Whitehead	Yes	95.0	23.8	93.0	23.3	93.0	14.0	94.0	14.1	94.0	14.1	90.0	4.5	93.7	2
4															
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															
16															
17															
18															
19															
20															
COMMENTS:				·4											<u>,</u>

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

9/6/2021



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description

Renton Technical College - New Health Science Cener

Consensus Date

9/6/2021

Project Number

2022-001

Name of Selection Panel Member

Laurie Kearney

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA		Relevent Experience		Project Approach & Innovation		Qualification Perso		Past Perfor		Experience		Life Cycle Cost Analysis Experience		TOTAL WEIGHTE	
	Scores	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	15%	Raw Score	15%	Raw Score	15%	Raw Score	5%	D SCORE	
1 HDR Architecture		94.0	23.5	91.0	22.8	92.0	13.8	93.0	14.0	91.0	13.7	90.0	4.5	92.2	1
2 McGranahan Architects		90.0	22.5	90.0	22.5	90.0	13.5	90.0	13.5	91.0	13.7	90.0	4.5	90.2	3
3 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		92.0	23.0	91.0	22.8	90.0	13.5	91.0	13.7	91.0	13.7	90.0	4.5	91.1	2
4															
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															
16															
17															
18															
19															
20															

Laurie Kearney 9/6/2021
Date



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description

Renton Technical College - New Health Science Cener

Consensus Dat

Project Number

9/6/2021

2022-001

Name of Selection Panel Member

Barry Baker

		Relevent Experience Pro		Project Approach & Innovation		Qualifications of Key Personnel		Past Performance & Project Management				le Cost xperience	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
Scores	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	15%	Raw Score	15%	Raw Score	15%	Raw Score	5%	SCORE	
	80.0	20.0	75.0	18.8	70.0	10.5	70.0	10.5	90.0	13.5	90.0	4.5	77.8	3
	80.0	20.0	85.0	21.3	70.0	10.5	65.0	9.8	90.0	13.5	90.0	4.5	79.5	2
	100.0	25.0	90.0	22.5	90.0	13.5	90.0	13.5	90.0	13.5	90.0	4.5	92.5	1
	Scores	80.0	80.0 20.0 80.0 20.0	80.0 20.0 75.0 80.0 20.0 85.0	80.0 20.0 75.0 18.8 80.0 20.0 85.0 21.3	80.0 20.0 75.0 18.8 70.0 80.0 20.0 85.0 21.3 70.0	80.0 20.0 75.0 18.8 70.0 10.5 80.0 20.0 85.0 21.3 70.0 10.5	80.0 20.0 75.0 18.8 70.0 10.5 70.0 80.0 20.0 85.0 21.3 70.0 10.5 65.0	80.0 20.0 75.0 18.8 70.0 10.5 70.0 10.5 80.0 20.0 85.0 21.3 70.0 10.5 65.0 9.8	80.0 20.0 75.0 18.8 70.0 10.5 70.0 10.5 90.0 80.0 20.0 85.0 21.3 70.0 10.5 65.0 9.8 90.0	80.0 20.0 75.0 18.8 70.0 10.5 70.0 10.5 90.0 13.5 80.0 20.0 85.0 21.3 70.0 10.5 65.0 9.8 90.0 13.5	80.0 20.0 75.0 18.8 70.0 10.5 70.0 10.5 90.0 13.5 90.0 80.0 20.0 85.0 21.3 70.0 10.5 65.0 9.8 90.0 13.5 90.0	80.0 20.0 75.0 18.8 70.0 10.5 70.0 10.5 90.0 13.5 90.0 4.5 80.0 20.0 85.0 21.3 70.0 10.5 65.0 9.8 90.0 13.5 90.0 4.5	80.0 20.0 75.0 18.8 70.0 10.5 70.0 10.5 90.0 13.5 90.0 4.5 77.8 80.0 20.0 85.0 21.3 70.0 10.5 65.0 9.8 90.0 13.5 90.0 4.5 79.5

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

COMMENTS:

Barry Baker
Barry Baker

9/6/2021 Date 9/7/21

Date 9/7/2



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description

Renton Technical College - New Health Science Cener

Consensus Date

9/6/2021

Project Number
2022-001

Name of Selection Panel Member

Jacob Jackson

Project Approach & **Qualifications of Key** Past Performance & Sustainable Design Life Cycle Cost TOTAL **CRITERIA** Relevent Experience **RANK** Innovation Personnel **Project Management Analysis Experience** WEIGHTED Experience ORDER SCORE Raw Score Raw Score Scores Raw Score Raw Score 25% Raw Score 15% Raw Score 1 HDR Architecture 17.5 13.5 3 70.0 0.08 20.0 90.0 70.0 10.5 0.08 12.0 80.0 4.0 77.5 2 McGranahan Architects 90.0 22.5 90.0 22.5 90.0 13.5 85.0 12.8 80.0 12.0 80.0 4.0 2 87.3 3 Schreiber Starling Whitehead 95.0 23.8 95.0 23.8 90.0 13.5 90.0 13.5 0.08 12.0 80.0 4.0 90.5 1 4 5 6 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 COMMENTS:

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

do

9/6/2021 Date

b Jackson



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET Project description Renton Technical College - New Health Science Cener Consensus Date 9/6/2021 2022-001

Name of Selection Panel Member

Jonathan Taylor

CRITERIA		Relevent Ex	xperience	Project Approach & Innovation		Qualifications of Key Personnel		Past Performance & Project Management		Sustainable Design Experience		Life Cyc Analysis E	le Cost cperience	TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE	RANK
	Scores	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	25%	Raw Score	15%	Raw Score	15%	Raw Score	15%	Raw Score	5%	JOOKE	
1 HDR Architecture		85.0	21.3	93.0	23.3	91.0	13.7	88.0	13.2	98.0	14.7	93.0	4.7	90.7	3
2 McGranahan Architects		92.0	23.0	90.0	22.5	90.0	13.5	90.0	13.5	94.0	14.1	95.0	4.8	91.4	2
3 Schreiber Starling Whitehead		90.0	22.5	95.0	23.8	92.0	13.8	94.0	14.1	96.0	14.4	97.0	4.9	93.4	1
4															
5															
6															
7										1			17.64		
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															
16															
17															
18															
19															
20	an ang an														

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

9/6/2021

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description

Renton Technical College - New Health Science Cener

Date of Evaluation 9/15/2021 Project Number 2022-001

Name of Selection Panel Member

Ariel Birtley

	This Scoresheet Bed				Ar	riel Birtl	ey					
	CRITERIA	Weighting		inahan itects		r Starling ehead	HDR Architecture					
	CRITERIA	weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION		15%	89.0	13.4	92.0	13.8	90.0	13.5				
Management Plan: How is t	the team set up to manage this project f	or the Client.	What is the	eir philosoph	y towords w	orking collab	oratively wit	n clients and	d other outwa	ard looking i	ssues.	
Team Member Qualification	s: Are the relevent team members pres	ent and what	role are the	v assuming	in the discus							
	ties: Does the firm explain their workloa			·			he firm's ove	rall planning	 1			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	<u> </u>	20%	88.0	17.6	92.0	18.4	90.0	18.0	, 			
	d on the information provided and the Fi	_							how well ha	ve they man	l aged develo	pment of
project scope in the past.	·	· 	·				· · ·					
Budgeting & Cost Control: \	What strategies does the firm use to est	ablish and m	anage proje	ct budgets.	How succes	sful have th	ey been with	past projec	ts			
Project Scheduling: How do	oes this finalist team develop schedules.	. How well do	they listen	to client sch	edule needs	and then m	eet client sc	nedule need	ls.			
PROJECT APPROACH		25%	93.0	23.3	95.0	23.8	94.0	23.5				
project and the project requi							rmational mt	g, or done in	ndependent	research to	better under	stand the
	: Has the Finalist attempted to define ch					,			1		1	1
EXPERIENCE	N. D. and the Einstead and discussion and	25%	91.0	22.8	93.0	23.3	92.0	23.0				
	1): Does the Finalist team discuss past v					Ü						
	team members): Do the individual tear	5%	89.0	4.5	90.0	4 5	90.0	4.5				
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALY	rsis EXPERIENCE erstand the value in a comprehensive Lit								-4-2			1.004
ELCCA?	erstand the value in a comprehensive Li	ie Cycle Cosi	exercise in	decision ma	iking? Are ti	iey iamiliar i	with the OFIV	ı requiremei	nts? Are the	y dillerentia	ung between	LCCA and
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EX	XPERIENCE	10%	88.0	8.8	92.0	9.2	94.0	9.4				
What strategies have the Fi	nalists indicated might be appropriate fo	r this project.	. How can t	he sustainat	oility strategy	s mesh with	the project b	oudget.	•		•	
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCL (indicate included or not incl		Not Scored	inclu	uded	inclu	uded	inclu	ıded				
TOTAL Raw SCORE		100%	538.0		554.0		550.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORI	E			90.2		92.9		91.9				
FINAL RANK ORDER				3		1		2				
COMMENTS:												

Arisl Birtley Ariel Birtley

Sep 24, 2021

Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Renton Technical Col	lege - New Health Science Cene
Date of Evaluation	Project Number 2022-001
Name of Selection Panel Mem	ber

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Inis Scoresneet	Becomes	Public	Record	1							
			anahan	SS	SW	н	DR .				
CRITERIA	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	15%	90.0	13.5	90.0	13.5	90.0	13.5				
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this p	project for the Clie	nt. What is	their philoso	phy toword	s working co	llaboratively	with clients	and other o	utward looki	ng issues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team member	rs present and wh	at role are t	hey assumir	ng in the dis	cussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their	workload for the c	luration of th	ne project an	nd how this	project fits in	to the firm's	overall plan	ning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	90.0	18.0	93.0	18.6	90.0	18.0				
<u>Scope Management:</u> Based on the information provided and of project scope in the past.	d the Finalist's exp	perience, ho	w well has th	ne team ace	rtained basi	c project red	uirements a	and how well	have they r	nanaged de	velopmen
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use	e to establish and	manage pro	oject budget	s. How suc	cessful have	they been v	with past pro	ojects			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop sch	edules. How well	do they liste	en to client s	chedule nee	eds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eeds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	90.0	22.5	92.0	23.0	90.0	22.5				
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated the project and the project requirements	that they have re	eviewed ava	ilable projec	t informatio	n, attended i	nformationa	l mtg, or dor	ne independ	ent research	n to better ur	nderstand
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to de	efine challenges a	nd/or opport	unities they	see for the	project?						
EXPERIENCE	25%	92.0	23.0	95.0	23.8	89.0	22.3				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discus	•										
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individe	ual team member	s have expe	rience that r	elates to the	project type	e or complex	kity?	1	L	ı	T
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	5%	90.0	4.5	90.0	4.5	90.0	4.5				
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehen and ELCCA?	sive Life Cycle Co	ost exercise	in decision i	making? Ar	e they famili	ar with the C	OFM require	ments? Are	they differe	entiating betv	veen LCC
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	90.0	9.0	90.0	9.0	92.0	9.2				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be approp	oriate for this proje	ect. How ca	n the sustair	nability strat	egys mesh v	vith the proje	ect budget.		L	•	120200000000000000000000000000000000000
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	542.0		550.0		541.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			90.5		92.4		90.0				
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		1		3				
COMMENTS:											

Laurie Kearney

9.16.21 Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Renton Technical Col	lege - New Health Science Cene
Date of Evaluation	Project Number 2022-001
Name of Selection Panel Mem	ber
В	Sarry Baker

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Tillo Cool collect Do	Dury Burci										
CRITERIA	Weighting		ınahan	s	SW	н	DR .				
UNITERIA	weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	15%	90.0	13.5	95.0	14.3	90.0	13.5				
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project	t for the Clie	nt. What is	their philoso	phy toword	s working co	llaboratively	with clients	and other o	utward look	ing issues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre	sent and wh	at role are t	hey assumir	ng in the dis	cussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workl	oad for the d	uration of th	ne project ar	nd how this p	project fits in	to the firm's	overall plan	ning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	95.0	19.0	95.0	19.0	85.0	17.0				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the	Finalist's exp	erience, ho	w well has t	ne team ace	rtained basi	c project red	uirements a	nd how well	have they	managed de	velopment
of project scope in the past.											
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e			·					<u> </u>			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	en to client s	chedule nee	eds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	90.0	22.5	90.0	22.5	90.0	22.5		5.6		
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that the project and the project requirements	they have re	viewed ava	ilable projec	t information	n, attended i	nformationa	l mtg, or dor	ne independ	ent researc	h to better u	nderstand
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define of	hallenges ar	nd/or opport	unities they	see for the	project?						
EXPERIENCE	25%	90.0	22.5	90.0	22.5	85.0	21.3				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas	t work the fir	m has done	and how th	at relates o	r provides g	uidance for t	his project?		•		
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te	am members	have expe	rience that r	elates to the	project typ	e or complex	city?				
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	5%	90.0	4.5	90.0	4.5	90.0	4.5				
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive and ELCCA?	ife Cycle Co	st exercise	in decision	making? Ar	e they famili	ar with the 0	DFM require	ments? Are	they differe	entiating bet	ween LCC
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	85.0	8.5	85.0	8.5	95.0	9.5				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate	for this proje	ect. How ca	n the sustai	nability strat	egys mesh v	with the proje	ect budget.				
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	540.0		545.0		535.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			90.5		91.3		88.3				
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		1		3				
COMMENTS:											

Barry Baker 9/16/21
Barry Baker Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Renton Technical College - N	ew Health Science Cene
Date of Evaluation	Project Number
9/15/2021	2022-001
Name of Selection Panel Member	- 1
Jacob Ja	ckson

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA	Waighting	McGranahan Architects		Schreiber Starling Whitehead		HDR Architecture					
	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	15%	90.0	13.5	95.0	14.3	80.0	12.0				
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project for the Client. What is their philosophy towords working collaboratively with clients and other outward looking issues.											
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pres	ent and wha	at role are th	ney assumin	g in the disc	ussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their worklo	ad for the d	uration of th	e project an	d how this p	roject fits int	o the firm's	overall planr	ning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	20%	90.0	18.0	90.0	18.0	90.0	18.0				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the Finalist's experience, how well has the team acertained basic project requirements and how well have they managed development of project scope in the past.										elopment	
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to es						they been w	ith past pro	jects			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedules	s. How well	do they liste	n to client s	chedule nee	ds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	85.0	21.3	90.0	22.5	80.0	20.0				
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that the project and the project requirements	hey have re	viewed avai	lable project	information	, attended in	formational	mtg, or done	e independe	nt research	to better und	derstand
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define c	hallenges an	nd/or opport	unities they	see for the p	roject?						
EXPERIENCE	25%	95.0	23.8	95.0	23.8	85.0	21.3				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past	work the fire	m has done	and how the	at relates or	provides gu	idance for th	nis project?				
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tea	m members	have exper	ience that re	elates to the	project type	or complex	ity?		I	1	
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	5%	90.0	4.5	90.0	4.5	90.0	4.5				
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Life Cycle Cost exercise in decision making? Are they familiar with the OFM requirements? Are they differentiating between LCCA and ELCCA?										een LCCA	
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	95.0	9.5	95.0	9.5	90.0	9.0				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate for this project. How can the sustainability strategys mesh with the project budget.											
TOTAL Raw SCORE	100%	545.0		555.0		515.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			90.5		92.5		84.8				
FINAL RANK ORDER			2		1		3				
COMMENTS:											

Sep 23, 2021

Jacob Jackson Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description

Renton Technical College - New Health Science Cener

Date of Evaluation Project Number 2022-001

Name of Selection Panel Member

	This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record						Jonathan Taylor							
CRITERIA		Weighting	McGranahan		ssw		HDR							
			Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score		
ORGANIZATION		15%	92.0	13.8	90.0	13.5	90.0	13.5						
Management Plan: How is t	he team set up to manage this project	for the Clie	nt. What is	their philoso	phy towords	working co	llaboratively	with clients	and other o	utward looki	ing issues.	****		
Team Member Qualifications	: Are the relevent team members pre-	sent and wh	at role are th	ney assumir	g in the disc	ussion						~~~~~~		
Capacity/Prodution Capabilit	ies: Does the firm explain their worklo	ad for the d	uration of th	e project ar	d how this p	roject fits in	to the firm's	overall plan	ining					
PROJECT MANAGEMENT		20%	90.0	18.0	92.0	18.4	90.0	18.0						
Scope Management: Based of project scope in the past.	on the information provided and the F	inalist's exp	erience, ho	w well has th	ne team ace	rtained basi	c project red	uirements a	and how well	have they r	managed de	velopment		
Budgeting & Cost Control: V	Vhat strategies does the firm use to es	stablish and	manage pro	ject budget	s. How succ	essful have	they been v	vith past pro	ojects			~~~~		
Project Scheduling: How do	es this finalist team develop schedules	s. How well	do they liste	n to client s	chedule nee	ds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eeds.					
PROJECT APPROACH		25%	91.0	22.8	94.0	23.5	92.0	23.0						
Understanding of this project the project and the project re	t: Has the Finalist demonstrated that equirements	they have re	eviewed ava	ilable projec	t informatior	ı, attended i	nformationa	l mtg, or do	ne independ	ent researcl	h to better ur	nderstand		
Challenges & Opportunities:	Has the Finalist attempted to define c	hallenges a	nd/or opport	unities they	see for the	project?	_		,					
EXPERIENCE		25%	92.0	23.0	94.0	23.5	90.0	22.5			1			
Relevant Past Projects (firm	: Does the Finalist team discuss past	t work the fir	m has done	and how th	at relates o	provides g	uidance for t	his project?	r .					
Relevant Past Projects (key	team members): Do the individual tea	member		rience that i	elates to the	project typ	1	city?	1		т			
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALY	SIS EXPERIENCE	5%	92.0	4.6	94.0	4.7	92.0	4.6						
Does the Finalist team unde and ELCCA?	rstand the value in a comprehensive L	ife Cycle Co	ost exercise	in decision	making? Ar	e they famili	iar with the (OFM require	ements? Are	they differe	entiating bet	ween LCCA		
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EX	PERIENCE	10%	90.0	9.0	92.0	9.2	93.0	9.3						
What strategies have the Fir	nalists indicated might be appropriate	for this proje	ect. How ca	n the sustai	nability strat	egys mesh v	with the proje	ect budget.						
TOTAL Raw SCORE		100%	547.0		556.0		547.0							
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE				91.2		92.8		90.9						
FINAL RANK ORDER				2		1		3		İ	<u> </u>			
COMMENTS:		***************************************				************		**********		one di la decimina de				

Jonathan Taylor

9.15.202/ Date

2022-001-ScoresheetSummary

Final Audit Report 2021-09-24

Created: 2021-09-23

By: Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov)

Status: Signed

Transaction ID: CBJCHBCAABAAw0VemWWDGtS9p6N7L480etNiqY285l-g

"2022-001-ScoresheetSummary" History

- Document created by Angeline Ernst (angeline.ernst@des.wa.gov) 2021-09-23 8:20:44 PM GMT- IP address: 198.238.242.30
- Document emailed to Ariel Birtley (ariel.birtley@des.wa.gov) for signature 2021-09-23 8:34:55 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Laurie Kearney (laurie.kearney@des.wa.gov) for signature 2021-09-23 8:34:56 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Barry Baker (bbaker@rtc.edu) for signature 2021-09-23 8:34:56 PM GMT
- Document emailed to jacob.jackson@rtc.edu jacob.jackson@rtc.edu (jacob.jackson@rtc.edu) for signature 2021-09-23 8:34:56 PM GMT
- Document emailed to Jonathan Taylor (artman.taylor@gmail.com) for signature 2021-09-23 8:34:56 PM GMT
- Email viewed by jacob.jackson@rtc.edu jacob.jackson@rtc.edu (jacob.jackson@rtc.edu) 2021-09-23 8:35:32 PM GMT- IP address: 192.64.1.146
- Document e-signed by jacob.jackson@rtc.edu jacob.jackson@rtc.edu (jacob.jackson@rtc.edu)

 Signature Date: 2021-09-23 8:36:55 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 192.64.1.146
- Email viewed by Ariel Birtley (ariel.birtley@des.wa.gov) 2021-09-23 9:26:29 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.65.254
- Email viewed by Jonathan Taylor (artman.taylor@gmail.com)
 2021-09-23 9:40:15 PM GMT- IP address: 107.77.212.226
- Document e-signed by Jonathan Taylor (artman.taylor@gmail.com)

 Signature Date: 2021-09-23 9:44:59 PM GMT Time Source: server- IP address: 107.77.212.226



Email viewed by Barry Baker (bbaker@rtc.edu) 2021-09-23 - 9:49:58 PM GMT- IP address: 73.53.45.140

Document e-signed by Barry Baker (bbaker@rtc.edu)

Signature Date: 2021-09-23 - 10:28:39 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 73.53.45.140

🖰 Email viewed by Laurie Kearney (laurie.kearney@des.wa.gov)

2021-09-24 - 4:25:31 AM GMT- IP address: 104.47.65.254

Document e-signed by Laurie Kearney (laurie.kearney@des.wa.gov)

Signature Date: 2021-09-24 - 4:13:13 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30

Email viewed by Ariel Birtley (ariel.birtley@des.wa.gov)

2021-09-24 - 9:59:49 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.65.254

Document e-signed by Ariel Birtley (ariel.birtley@des.wa.gov)

Signature Date: 2021-09-24 - 10:03:53 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 198.238.242.30

Agreement completed.

2021-09-24 - 10:03:53 PM GMT